

Torrance Herald

Co-Publishers
KING WILLIAMS - GLENN W. PFEIL
REID L. BUNDY - Managing Editor

THURSDAY, JANUARY 24, 1963

On 'Backdoor' Spending

Congressman Frank J. Becker (R-N. Y.) last week introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives that would stop what he termed "backdoor spending" without the approval of the regular Appropriations Committee.

How far this very dynamic tax conservationist from Long Island will get in his logical, somewhat unorthodox route, remains to be seen; but, he should have ringing applause from millions in this country who are naturally opponents of waste in government. He stated:

"Every year, billions of dollars are spent by this method, simply by committees approving, and voted upon by Congress, authorizing the Treasury Department to sell bonds for vast sums of money for many programs. By this method, the regular Appropriations Committee is prevented from scanning the projects and looking over the expenditures." Becker said further that this back door spending is not reflected in the total appropriations of Congress and only adds to the total increase of deficits and the national debt.

Congressman Becker recalled that 150 members of the House joined in introducing this same resolution in the 87th Congress, but failed to pry it loose from the "liberal 15-man Rules Committee." Becker said, "This again proves that the so-called liberals, just want to keep on being liberal with the taxpayers money without regard to inflation caused by this liberal spending."

With Congressman Becker who, incidentally, has a daughter and grandchildren residing in Torrance, millions of American taxpayers feel that such a bill is timely in view of President Kennedy's request for tax reductions.

American Heritage

"Ransom" is an ugly word. It takes the mind back to the Middle Ages, when it was a commonplace accompaniment of war and, in following centuries, to when the Barbary pirates grew rich on it. Now Fidel has successfully revived this barbaric custom, by exchanging some 1,100 prisoners taken during the dreadfully mishandled Bay of Pigs invasion, for \$53 million worth of supplies, consisting of food and drugs, that oppressed Cuba desperately needs.

The U. S. government did not participate as an active partner in the barter deal—it could not. But it gave its tacit approval, on purely humanitarian grounds. And the response by the enterprises whose cooperation was vital was immediate.

Pan American World Airways provided a plane shuttle service, to carry both the ransomed men and some cargoes to and from Havana.

U. S. pharmaceutical companies provided the great quantities of drugs that Cuba needs and Castro demanded.

U. S. steamship lines provided ships to transport the major part of the supplies, and to serve passengers too ill to travel by air.

U. S. food manufacturers made essential contributions. U. S. labor unions joined in hurrying the project through. And the U. S. Red Cross administered it all.

None of these participants, one may be sure, has anything but loathing for the ransom scheme. But, when the lives of 1,100 courageous defenders of human freedom were at stake, they did what had to be done. That is in proud accord with the American heritage.

Peace From Strength

Senator Goldwater, in one of his late newspaper columns, finds great satisfaction in the fact that President Kennedy made tours of some major U. S. military installations and has, in public statements, spoken of our military power "as the foundation stone of the United States diplomacy." The senator adds: "Newspaper reports . . . say he has been deeply awed by the tremendous power at his command."

The senator's point is that it is this power that maintains the peace, and the President has made it plain that he too holds that view. And no one can rationally argue that the Free World would have much chance of surviving if that power did not exist, and in ever-increasing might. This country is the West's arsenal and guardian. A weak United States would amount to an invitation to the Soviets to throw their plans of world conquest into high gear—and the Soviets do not refuse invitations of that nature.

We hope for a time when disarmament will be possible, and when the vast resources in money, in human energy, in scientific achievement that military power consumes can be used for happier ends. But that time is not now—nor does its light show even feebly on the horizon. Meanwhile, as Mr. Goldwater eloquently puts it, we must preserve our power advantage . . . and enhance it by constant development of new weapons and new techniques—not to wage war against Soviet Russia, but to wage an effective peace."

Opinions of Others

There has been a great deal of talk that the new administration may well be advised to make some temporary tax cuts as one means of getting the economy moving again. . . . The dissident thought occurs: Is this what taxes are for? Are they meant to provide the necessary costs of government, or are they intended to be a magic wand that will change or cure, speed or retard our economic and social enterprises? A tax cut, even though temporary, would of course be welcome. But would it be far sounder and more beneficial if it reflected a reduction in government expenditures.—Hartland, (Wisc.) Reporter.

Freedom of opportunity is related in one of the parables of the Bible. You will remember the parable of the talents, wherein three men were given one, two and five talents. The man who had one talent buried his, but the other two worked hard and they increased their holdings two fold.—Marion, (Iowa.) Sentinel.

Are You Still Kidding 'Em—



ROYCE BRIER

Faceless Vietnam War As Americans Fight On

The Constitution, Art. 1, Sec. 8, says, "The Congress shall have the power . . . to declare war . . ."

Note, it does not grant the power to wage undeclared war, though Sec. 8 may imply that by empowering the Congress to "provide for the common defense . . . of the United States . . ."

Anyway, Presidents as commanders-in-chief have from the beginning waged little wars without congressional authority. And even big ones: Mr. Lincoln did so on the rebellious Southern States before Congress convened, and Mr. Truman did it in Korea and called it a police action by the United Nations.

In the main, however, these little undeclared wars and the two big ones, have been understood by the people because they had available information about the purpose and course of the military action.

Unhappily, this is not the case in Vietnam, where for a couple of years American armed forces have been waging a masked war against Communist guerrillas known as Viet Cong.

Recently government troops were ambushed by about 600 Viet Cong in a rice paddy village. They were accompanied by American technicians and trainers. There was a 20-

hour battle. Five helicopters were shot down. Some scores of Vietnamese were killed, and so were three American soldiers.

This battle was described briefly in the news stories. There was almost no combat detail. There was round figure for government wounded—100. But it was a defeat, and an American defeat, since the technical planning for this jungle warfare devolves on the Americans.

Gen. Paul Harkins, USA, is in command of American forces. We know little of the composition of these forces, or of their strength. After the battle, General Harkins was quoted as saying government forces had surrounded the Viet Cong. Correspondents trying to cover this war have for months been quoting various officers in effect that the defeat of the guerrillas is imminent.

President Kennedy has not told the American people in a clear way what this minuscule war is all about. They have been told vaguely it is to keep southeast Asia out of the clutches of the Reds. They know in a vague way they have a favorite side, yet the good guys don't look much better than the bad guys. Again, in a vague way, they know involvement gets deeper and more confusing by the month.

The Pentagon, that great, faceless expanse of brass, says 24 Americans have been killed so far. Isn't that enough for Americans to know?

Mailbox

Editor, Torrance Herald: Headline in last Thursday's Herald: "City Gains 21,527 New Dwelling Units in 1962." The following article starts thus: "Dwelling units for 21,527 new families were provided in Torrance . . ."

The breakdown given is: new one-family homes, 373; dwelling units in multiple dwellings, 2,126; dwelling units in duplex dwellings, 28. Total new units, 2,527.

Total headlined at stated 21,527. Difference, 19,000. Somewhere in my evaluation of the Herald's figures I have lost 19,000 dwelling units. Would you please tell me what I have done with them?

FRANK W. SIMCOE

Editor's Note: We've always had trouble balancing check stubs and it looks now like we can't add up building figures either. Mr. Simcoe hasn't lost 19,000 dwellings, it's apparent they existed only in our faulty figuring. The true figures, however, are impressive.

AFTER HOURS By John Morley

The Congo Crisis as Seen From a Washington View

WASHINGTON, D.C. — I'm here at the Capitol to address the Woman's Conference on National Security, comprising several thousand delegates from all the 50 states . . . and representing 16 national organizations, including the American Legion auxiliary, Armed Forces league and others.

Prior to my talk this evening I went to the White House and Capitol Hill for last minute facts on the Congo mess. My findings go something like this.

Most members of Congress I talked to, or listened to, appear disgusted with the UN policy in the Congo and especially the use of military force against untrained and poorly armed Congolese.

One called it "illegal, immoral, idiotic." Another, "the ugly truth is that deceit, arrogance and duplicity prevailed by an organization (UN) established to keep the peace."

Another said, "Against the advice of our closest allies . . . Britain, France, Belgium . . . the U.S. supported the assault against Moise Tshombe, probably the best friend we had in all the Congo."

An investigation of our Congo policy will be proposed on the floor this week.

At this writing the United Nations forces have virtually taken control of Katanga. They will in time force its reunification with the Leopoldville central government of Premier Cyrille Adoula.

While forceful reintegration of Katanga is about to be completed, what about the hundreds of thousands of Katangans who are loyal to Tshombe, and who do not approve the division of their revenues from Union Miniere du Haut, the Belgium mining company, with the central government.

In practical terms the UN is forcing a million Katangese, who speak a different language, and are from a different culture and standard of living, to share their wealth with 14 million other Congolese they don't know or care much about.

The six provinces of the Congo are as different as Russia is to Finland. The UN policy is to take 50 per cent of Katanga's revenues from mining and give it to the central government, thus reducing Katanga's standard of living, all present government services, incomes, schools, hospitals, roads, etc.

The main issue involved is the right of the UN to impose Adoula on the Katanga province, whereas Katanga prefers Tshombe and a major share of the mining revenues.

On this issue the Soviet union joins our closest allies in opposition to the UN action against Katanga, but for different reasons. Russia wants a weak Congo, which would result without Katanga.

France, Britain and Belgium object on the grounds that UN interference in any country's internal affairs is illegal.

There is no doubt from the U.S. point of view that reintegration of Katanga will make for a stronger central government . . . but it is right to effect this at the expense of the Katangese people who want no part of the other Congo provinces. Least of all, to reduce their standard of living for the benefit of strangers.

I discussed the Congo with UN representatives here and at the UN in New York. The UN policy of using force, they claim, is supported by mandate . . . "to maintain the territorial integrity of the Congo . . . to evacuate foreign mercenaries . . . to prevent civil war."

To the question that Tshombe is the legally-elected president of Katanga, and holds the only legal mandate from nearly a million Congolese, the UN spokesmen had no answer.

The U.S. position is that integration will make for a healthier Congo and less danger from communism. Because of this we supported the imprisonment of communist Antoine Gizenga in Leopoldville.

Belgium is now leaning to the UN position, but insists

that Tshombe must remain as president of Katanga.

France, while opposing the UN military operation, supports reintegration, but also wants Tshombe in charge of Katanga and given a post in the central government.

Britain's policy includes reintegration of Katanga, but not through force. They support Tshombe over Adoula, hoping to maintain its present link between its copper interests in Rhodesia and Katanga.

Britain has more holdings in Katanga mines than any other country, including Belgium, and any protracted political solution would entail serious financial losses.

On the other hand, the African countries bordering the Congo back Adoula, for they fear the influence of a strong, rich Katanga.

At present the Katanga provincial capitol of Elizabethville is controlled by UN forces. Before long they undoubtedly will occupy Kolwezi, Dilolo and Luena, ending most formal resistance.

The big question now is Tshombe. Will he recoup his forces and fight . . . will he be assassinated by agents of the Leopoldville government . . . or will he accept reintegration temporarily, while he ponders the best way to get rid of both Adoula and the UN.

Our Man Hoppe

Viet Army Against Dying

Art Hoppe

We got problems in South Vietnam. Despite years of training, billions in arms and the best military advice, the Loyal Royal Vietnamese troops still "lack aggressiveness." Which is the worst thing you can say about an army.

Our military advisers leap bravely to the top of trenches, wave their .45s and cry "Forward, men! Do you want to live forever?" And the Loyal Royal troops look at each other, nod their heads and say, "Yes."

So we're having a rough time winning the Cold War in South Vietnam. It's a little like the problem we faced once in the nearby kingdom of West Vhtnng.

It was the 12th year of our multi-billion-dollar program to help Premier Ngo Mahn Ngo wipe out the dread Viet-Narians and build a villa on the French Riviera. Frustrations were mounting. The dread Moscow-trained Viet-Narian peasants kept plowing their rice paddies and thatching their huts. And the stalwart Loyal Royal Army kept sitting in its trenches writing poetry. Like: "See the Caterpillar Resting on the Litchi Leaf."

For six years, Colonel E. G. Farnham, a brave and dashing military adviser, had been climbing the ramparts each morning. "For duty and for glory, men," he would shout, "let us charge forward to die for West Vhtnng!" And the only response he ever got was from a corporal who looked up at him curiously and asked: "What are you, some kind of nut?"

It was too much. The colonel slammed down his helmet and stormed off to see the premier. "Look, Premier," he said, "I know your men are barbarous and uncivilized. But if they don't start showing a bit more willingness to get out there and shoot up their fellow citizens, we may have to reduce our aid program."

"Aiyee!" says the premier. And as soon as the colonel leaves, he gets on the phone to his cousin, Ho Ho Ho, leader of the dread Viet-Narians. "Couz," he says, "things look grim. Unless our side (shudder) hurts somebody on your side, we are going to get cut off at the pocket-book. And we are still in hock for the east wing of the villa."

"Woe, woe, woe," says Ho Ho Ho, "Moscow is on my back for the same reason. Unless our side draws (ugh) blood from your side, not another ruble will we get. And . . . Hold it! I just got an idea. I will demand Moscow send me some Soviet technicians."

And it worked like a charm. The Soviet technicians naturally potted a couple of American advisers. The American advisers, in revenge, drilled several Soviet technicians. And in no time the technicians and the advisers were engaged in full-scale battles with many on both sides dying for duty, for glory and for West Vhtnng.

The public in Russia and the public in America regained interest in the war and funds from both sides to West Vhtnng were doubled. The villa was finished, the rice fields were plowed and everybody was happy. Except maybe the Loyal Royal Army which complained that with all the noise going on up there it was very hard to compose thoughtful poetry down in the trenches. But the premier told them everybody had to make sacrifices because there was a Cold War on.

So I guess it all goes to prove you can easily equip a backward people with guns, bullets, tanks and napalm bombs. But it's a little harder to give them the desire to go out and kill their fellow man. After all, you can't civilize a new nation over night.

Morning Report:

A lot of news comes pouring out of the White House. But apparently you have to stand outside the back door to get it. This naturally annoys the reporters who are hanging around properly in the front parlor.

The latest example was the English reporter who was able to quote the President on world problems a couple of days before the homegrown Washington correspondents.

All of which reminds me I won't know for three days where President Kennedy thinks we stand. He told where in a special article in Look magazine. And I'm not due for my barbershop reading until later this week.

Abe Mellinkoff